

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow. Applicants respectfully request that this Amendment and Reply be considered and entered because it believed to place the application in condition for allowance.

Claims 48-53 and 59-65 were pending in this application. Claims 48, 60, and 63 have been amended, and claims 59, 62, and 64-65 have been canceled. Applicants thus submit claims 48-53, 60-61, and 63 for reconsideration.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the interview on January 25, 2005, during which Applicants and the Examiner discussed claim 60 (now amended), claim 62 (now canceled), and the references applied in the Office Action. Applicants have amended claim 48 (the only remaining independent claim in the application) in a manner consistent with the discussion had with the Examiner at the interview.

Claims 48-53 and 59-65 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Johnson (USP 5,934,751) in view of Chapel (USP 4,237,577). Applicants request withdrawal of this rejection for at least the following reason.

Claim 48, as amended, defines a child seat “wherein the curved surface of at least one of the hooks opposes the curved surface of at least two of the other hooks; and wherein all of the hooks are attached to one of the base and the backrest, and the bar is attached to the other of the base and the backrest.”

As conceded in the Office Action, Johnson fails to show at least one hook having a curved surface that opposes the curved surface of at least two other hooks. The Office Action relies on Chapel to teach this feature. Chapel discloses a safety hinge that includes a cylindrical bearing tube 20 on one hinge leaf and two segments 22, 24 on the other hinge leaf. Assuming for the sake of argument that tube 20 and segments 22, 24 are hooks, these “hooks” 20, 22, 24 are on two separate structures – a small leaf 16 and a large leaf 12. Claim 48, however, requires that the all the hooks be attached to a single structure – either a base or a backrest. Thus, Chapel does not teach or suggest the hook arrangement required by claim 48.

For at least this reason, Applicants submit that claim 48 and its dependent claims are not rendered obvious by Johnson and Chapel, either singly or in any reasonable combination. Applicants thus request withdrawal of the rejection.

Applicants note that claim 60 has been amended to depend from claim 48. Applicants also note that claim 63 has been amended to replace "the plurality of hooks" with "the hooks" to make claim 63 consistent with the remaining pending claims in this application.

Applicants believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 CFR 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 CFR 1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date February 10, 2005

By Mary Michelle Kile

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5428
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Mary Michelle Kile
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 35,217